



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/779,687	02/18/2004	Yinon Levy	2954/2	8948
<div>7590 01/25/2007 DR. MARK FRIEDMAN LTD. C/o Bill Polkinghorn Discovery Dispatch 9003 Florin Way Upper Marlboro, MD 20772</div>			<div>EXAMINER DIMYAN, MAGID Y</div>	
			<div>ART UNIT 2825</div>	<div>PAPER NUMBER</div>
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE		
3 MONTHS	01/25/2007	PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/779,687	Applicant(s) LEVY, YINON	
	Examiner Magid Y. Dimyan	Art Unit 2825	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 February 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-42 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9, 11-15, 18-26, 28-32, 35-38 and 40 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 10, 16, 17, 27, 33, 34, 39, 41 and 42 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 18 February 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This Office Action pertains to Application No. 10/779,687 filed 18 February 2004.

Claims 1 – 42 remain pending in this Application.

Claim Objections

2. Claims 3, 4, 9 – 11, 16, 17, 20, 21, 26 – 28, 33, 34, 38, 39, 41 and 42 are objected to because of the following issues:

- In claims 3, 4, 9, 11, 16, 17, 20, 21, 26, 28, 33, 34, 38, 39, 41 and 42, line 2: delete "the group" and insert --a group--.
- In claims 10 and 27, line 1: delete "from the" and insert --from a--.

3. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

5. **Claims 1 – 3, 5 – 8, 12 – 15, 18 – 20, 22 – 25, 29 – 32, 35 – 37 and 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,996,799 B1 to Cismas et al. (hereinafter, "Cismas").**

6. Regarding claims 1, 18 and 35, Cismas discloses a system (claim 1 – see Abstract), a method (claim 18 – see col. 2, ll. 13 – 18), and a computer software product

Art Unit: 2825

(claim 35 – see col. 2, ll. 18 – 26) for design automation (see col. 2, ll. 27 – 36) comprising: (a) a design entry system for selecting at least one design entry from a predetermined set of design entity templates (see Fig. 3B; col. 2, ll. 37 – 43; col. 7, ll. 33 – 46) 37 – 43; col. 7, ll. 33 – 46); (b) a mechanism for accepting at least one respective property for the design entity (see Fig. 3B, step 1; Abstract; col. 2, ll. 13 – 26); and (c) an HDL generator operative to produce HDL corresponding to the design entity according to it's respective property (see again Fig. 3B, steps 2 and 3; col. 2, ll. 13 – 46; col. 7, ll. 33 – 57). Thus, Cismas **clearly teaches** all the limitations as claimed.

7. As to claim 2, see Fig. 3B; Abstract; col. 6, ll. 13 – 26), which cite the preprocessor operative to accept property generic to the design entities (models).

8. As to claim 3, see col. 1, ll. 61 – 66; col. 10, ll. 35 – 51, which teach the claimed elements pertaining to the group of software languages used to generate the HDL code.

9. Pursuant to claims 5 – 8 and 12 – 15, see Figs. 6A – 6H; 9A, 9B; col. 9, ll. 9 – 38, which disclose the claimed limitations pertaining to embedded HDL text used in the design entity implementation.

10. Claims 19, 20, 22 – 25 and 29 – 32 contain the same limitations found in claims 2, 3, 5 – 8 and 12 – 15, respectively, and thus the same rejections also apply.

11. Claims 36, 37 and 40 contain the same limitations of claims 2, 5, and 12, respectively, and thus the same rejections apply.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

12. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 2825

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

13. Claims 4, 9, 11, 21, 26, 28 and 38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cismas over U.S. Patent No. 6,966,039 B1 to Bartz et al. (hereinafter, "Bartz").

Referring to claims 4, 9, 11, 21, 26, 28 and 38, Cismas teaches a system a method and a computer software product for design automation that includes automatically generating an HDL code corresponding to a design entity according to the design entity property via a computerized form mechanism (see items 4 – 7 above, as well as Figs. 6A – 6F; col. 10, ll. 35 – 55).

But Cismas is silent on including menus and graphical user interfaces (GUI's) in his invention.

However Bartz teaches a method to facilitate circuit design that cites using drop down menus (col. 1, ll. 30 – 35) and GUI (Abstract; Fig. 1C; col. 5, ll. 18 – 28) in his design methodology.

Drop down menus and GUI's are now commonly used in IC design, and can speed up design entries and design implementations. It would therefore be obvious to a person of obvious skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Cismas and Bartz in order to provide a selection

process in design automation via a mechanism selected from a group consisting of menus, computerized forms, and GUI's.

Allowable Subject Matter

14. Claims 10, 16, 17, 27, 33, 34, 39, 41 and 42 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the claim objections cited above and also rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

15. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: prior art does not teach the additional claimed limitations pertaining to RxStatements, RxPhase Statements, HitEvents statements, PauseResumeProperty statements and JumpProperty statements. Furthermore, prior art does not include the cited groups of design entities of claims 16, 17, 33, 34, 41 and 42.

Conclusion


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Magid Y. Dimyan whose telephone number is (571) 272-1889. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 8:00 AM - 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jack Chiang can be reached on (571) 272-7483. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Magid Y Dimyan
Examiner
Art Unit 2825

myd
18 January 2007



JACK CHIANG
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER